

~~History of a~~
A N S W E R

TO A

Scurrilous Pamphlet,

CALLED

Donatus Redivivus:

OR A

Reprimand to a Modern Church-Schismatick;

Lately Written by

A Dissenting Teacher; Occasion'd by
the Conversion and Baptism of Two
Young Gentlewomen.

By way of a LETTER from one of the said
Gentlewomen to the Rev^d. Mr. L——ter, M.A.
Library-Keeper at *Manchester*.

L O N D O N,

Printed and Sold by FERD. BURLEIGH in
Amen-Corner, MDCCXV.

I Li
ab
m
th

would h
and wit
pons, fo
which b
you cou
the expr
quires, a
tions in t
had shut
would ha
glect ob
with; a
first mov
sequence
of that,
glected l
without c

After a
to draw
for that
Teachers
severe T
which ou
I forbear
Attempts
mous Te
me left,
of Delusi
given the
little inco
declar'd n
to be rep

S I R,

I Little thought, when you were prevail'd with above a Year since, at the earnest Request of my self and Mrs. C—, to introduce us into the Church by Baptism, your Reputation would have been attack'd in so publick a manner, and with such unchristian and uncharitable Weapons, for doing the Office of a Christian Priest; which being regularly fought, I do not see how you could have deny'd us, without transgressing the exprefs Command of our Saviour; who requires, as well as empowers you, to *Baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, &c.* So that if you had shut this Door of Salvation against us, you would have been accountable for the wilful Neglect of that Talent your Master entrusted you with; and (as you were told, when you were first moved to it) answerable for all the evil Consequences which might have befallen us for want of that, which in your Opinion, could not be neglected by us, being convinc'd of its Necessity, without certain Damnation.

After all their strenuous and fruitless Endeavours to draw me into a Relapse, having made use of for that purpose, the Sophistry of their ablest Teachers, the sordid Motives of Self-interest, much severe Threatening, and scurrilous Language, which out of respect to my Dissenting Relations, I forbear to repeat: I say, after many such vain Attempts (especially since one of their most Famous Teachers concluded, there was no Hope of me left, being, as he affirm'd, given up to a Spirit of Delusion) I expected the Dissenters would have given themselves no further Trouble about such little inconsiderable Misses, as they have scornfully declar'd me, and the Companion of my Baptism to be reputed amongst them.

A 2

But

But after they had spent their Breath in reviling and opprobrious Language, some violent Leaders of the Party could not be satisfy'd, unless you and Mr. M——*n* were brought in for a share of their Scandal; and we were altogether spitefully misrepresented in the most publick manner that was possible. After they had pitch'd upon the fittest Person for this dirty Employment, one whom they knew, however defective in Judgment and solid Learning, would be credulous and profuse enough of their forg'd Scandal; to enable him the better to perform this Business according to their malicious Expectations, they furnish'd him with those false Accounts you meet with in the Dedication, Introduction and elsewhere. Striving thus with false and groundless Surmises, to make the World believe, as far as the Author's Credit will go, that the Pains taken in order to our Conversion, as well as our Conviction it self, were owing to some indirect Views, and proceeded more from a Desire of gratifying some worldly Lust, than from Principle and an undissembled sense of Duty.

I, for my part, having been long accusom'd to it, am no more mov'd by their impotent Scandal, than by their weak Sophistry; and their bare-fac'd Scurrility tends more to advance, than to lessen your Repute, with all sober judicious Persons who know your Behaviour in the World. It is for their Satisfaction, who are Strangers to your Persons and Characters, that I have ventur'd to publish a few short Remarks, as well as to abate the Author's Confidence and vain Conceit of this doughty Piece of borrow'd Sophistry.

Had this partial Compiler condescended to have read the many learned Answers, which in the space of two or three Years last past, have been publish'd, to every particular Objection in this boasted Collection; surely he would never have had

had the
Confiden
those Ar
been fu
have had
of Trans
he could
Ignoranc
reply, an
Readers
of the Q

I was a
Dedicatin
and excit
and remi
Truth be
his Lordsh
zed me, b
Direction
some Chi
a Lay-Ha
sious of
tion of h
rant for y
our earne

This A
charging
School, and
nocent Girl
their Bapti
Sir, Ha
Invalidity
received

Ministers,
ploy'd in
with mor
perswade
Covenan

had the Assurance to repeat them with so much Confidence, without taking the least Notice of those Answers, especially since he might have been furnished with them at a cheap rate, and have had one as well as the other for the Trouble of Transcribing: I can guess at no other reason he could have for concealing them, besides his Ignorance, or rather because he was unable to reply, and thought it not prudent to trust his Readers with the Arguments urged for both sides of the Question in Debate.

I was amazed to see this Author's Impudence in Dedicating his Book to our present Archbishop, and exciting his Lordship to call you to an account, and reminding him of *his known Concern for the Truth he defends*; when I was fully assured, that this Lordship, about half a Year before you baptized me, being consulted in a like Case, gave you Directions to baptize, with the Hypothetical Form, some Children who had been before sprinkled by a Lay-Hand, if their dissatisfied Parents were desirous of it: This surely was a sufficient Declaration of his Lordship's Judgment, and a good Warrant for your Conditional Baptization of us, after our earnest Application to you for that purpose.

This Author's Assurance is no less remarkable in charging you *with intruding into a Female Boarding-School, and imposing upon the Credulity of two poor innocent Girls, by wheedling them into a Renunciation of their Baptism.*

Sir, Had you laboured to convince us of the Invalidity of that Pretended Baptism, which we received from Hands of Usurping Unauthorized Ministers, I know not how you could be employ'd in a more charitable Office: I heartily wish more Pains were taken by our Clergy to persuade so many thousand unthinking Souls into a Covenanted State of Salvation. But to convince

vince my Reader what little Conscience this Author makes of his Words, or at best how easily he has been imposed on, I do declare, that I do not remember that you ever attempted to possess me with such an Opinion, and that you were not privy to my Desire of Baptism, till the very Day and Hour in which it was administred.

But you are told, That you ought to have looked out for Converts in some other Place, rather than in a Boarding-School, where young Ladies are placed not to learn their Religion, but good Breeding; *That these are reckoned amongst Protestants as safe Retirements as foreign Nunneries; that to attempt to Profelyte young Ladies from thence, was an indecent Encroachment upon the Constitutions of such reclusive Societies.*

I believe Mr. O ——— would be hard put to prove, that either of you ever came into the Boarding-School with that Intent, or ever discoursed with us about Religious Matters when you were there; what is more, I dare be positive, that you never had the least Acquaintance or Conversation of any kind with Mrs. C ———, before she offered her self to be Baptised. If we had had no other Opportunities of Conviction, besides what were afforded us in the Boarding-School, we had remained *Dissenters*, at least while we continued there. I have the greatest Reason to bless God for the good Effects of a Friendship I contracted with a Neighbouring Gentlewoman of singular Worth, which gave me those happy Opportunities of learning my Duty, which I might otherwise have wanted all my Life-time.

I find, he that will discourse or write to please the Dissenters, must affirm boldly without Proof and publish any thing which they think fit to put into his Mouth, without Gainfaying, or so much as a diligent Enquiry after Truth. If Mr. O ———

had not been more studious of gratifying a Party, than of publishing a true Account of this Matter, I am sure he had Opportunities enough of better information. But Truth is not to be spoken at all Times. In the Case before us it had quite spoiled the Undertaking, and very much lessened some Men's Esteem of this abusive Performance.

Having thus briefly examined the Dedication and Introduction, and set the Fact in a true Light, passing by some pitiful, malicious, groundless Suggestions, notorious Blunders and Improproprieties of Style, which are obvious to every Reader of common Sense, as deserving a severer Chastisement, than the soft Lashes of a Female's Pen. I should proceed next to the Consideration of his Three Chapters: But before I take them to task, it is that I should premise a short Apology for my Undertaking a Business which might be done with much more Learning and Exactness, by either of the two Divines concerned about my Baptism, and against whom the Pamphlet is principally levelled.

I know not whether either of you design to publish an Answer to this Pamphlet, I rather think you will find your selves some better Employment, and despise it, as indeed not worth your regarding, there being nothing in it which deserves or requires an Answer, which has not been fully satisfied in several Discourses lately Printed upon this Subject. The same Consideration should have restrained my Pen, but the clamorous Vauntings and publick Challenges of the *Dissenters* have made some sort of an Answer necessary. And I am the more induced to it, by the Hopes I have that this Letter may fall into the Hands of some Persons, who never read or heard of any former Discourses upon the Subject Matter of Debate. This however can be no Prejudice to your Undertaking, if you design any thing of this kind; and I should think my

my Pains well bestow'd, if the numerous Imperfections of mine, should occasion a more correct and ample Discourse from an abler Hand.

I must own, I have neither Capacity nor Opportunity of examining the Faithfulness of his Quotations, and therefore must be content to let them pass for Genuine: Tho' there is great Reason to suspect his Veracity in this respect, who has shewn so little Regard to Truth and Conscience in his relating Matter of Fact; and the rather because I am credibly informed, that he is guilty of falsely translating a Scrap of Latin out of *St. Augustine* on the Title-Page of his Book. By the by, Sir, I cannot but think Mr. O—— a very unfit Person to teach us the Sense of the Primitive Church about this or any other Subject, who has given the World such a remarkable Specimen of his Skill in their Original Languages, or of his Integrity in rendring them at his first setting out.

It is observable, Mr. O—— does not pretend to offer any Text of Scripture in favour of Lay-Baptism, nor to answer those Authorities and Arguments whereby its Validity has been disproved. Has not the Commission which our Saviour commanded to his Apostles, and their Successors, to Baptize, and his Promise *to be with them only*, i. e. to assist and confirm their Exercise of this Authority, *unto the end of the World*, been frequently urged to shew, That they and none but they have Power in his Name, and by his Authority to admit Persons Members of his Body Mystical; and that God having no where engaged to ratify the Acts of those who usurp his Name and Authority, and their Ministrations must consequently be void, and of none effect? Truly, Sir, I cannot help thinking Mr. O—— incapable of answering this, if I see it done by him.

I always thought, that bare Scripture without any help from Antiquity, had been the only Guide of a *Dissenter's* Judgment in Religious Affairs; but here a *Dissenting Teacher* overlooks Scripture, and would have us be determined by the naked Authorities of fallible Men. When they discoursed with me against the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, the earliest Fathers could not obtain a Hearing, their Evidence was rejected in the Lump, and they would submit to no Judge but meer Scripture: But now, even in Mr. O——n's Judgment, he deserves the hardest Censure, *who dares attack an ancient universal Custom, that has been universally received, and as strenuously defended*: I wish Mr. O——n would often inculcate this Lesson to his Pupils, which he still retains in Defiance to the lawful Commands of his Superiors. I have that Veneration for Antiquity, that I am willing for once to join Issue with Mr. O——n, and if he can prove Lay-Baptism to have been universally allow'd to be valid in the Primitive Church, I will own my self to have been mistaken, and thank him too for undeceiving me.

In the Close of his smart Introduction, he lays down the several Topicks he designed to insist upon in the following Pages: And in order to convince you of this unwarrantable Step, promises to shew, 1st, That to Re-baptize any Person that was once Baptized by Laymen in the Name of the Sacred Trinity, is contrary to the Practise of the Catholick Church in all Ages. 2^{dly}, That it is repugnant to the Principles and Practise of the Church of England. 3^{dly}, Then represent to you the pernicious Consequences of such a Practise. I expected, without looking any farther, that he would have confined himself to these three Topicks; and made them the three several Heads of his following Tract.

But alas! When he found his Authorities would fail him, he jumbles together with his first Proposition, another quite forreign to the Point in Debate; and instead of confining himself to the Subject of Lay-Baptism, tells you at the Head of his first Chapter, *That Rebaptization, the Doctrine of Hereticks, was condemned in all Ages, particularly by Pacianus, Optatus, St. Austin, St. Leo, Gennadius the Council of Arles, St. Gregory, and the Council of Lerida, and that St. Cyprian and Tertullian were censured for rebaptizing Hereticks.* A wonderful Discovery this! Who ever heard you deny it? Or knew you practise contrary to it? It is well known, Sir, you gave us Baptism, not for that Reason, because we had been before baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks, and because you looked upon such Baptism to be null and void; but because some Usurpers of the Ministerial Function had presumed to baptize us without Warrant or sufficient Call thereunto, and because you looked upon what they did, to be, strictly speaking, no Baptism, for want of Authority in the Administrators, they being no better than Laymen. It plainly appears to me from his first Proposition, at the End of his Introduction, and from your known Allowance of Baptism administred by Priests of the *Romish* Perswasion, that Mr. O——n knew these to be your Sentiments and Reasons for Baptizing us, namely, not because we were baptized by Hereticks or Schismaticks, but by Laymen, or properly speaking, because we were never baptized at all.

Notwithstanding this, he first palms an Opinion upon you, which was never yours, and then rails most bitterly at you for the same, by which he seems to treat you with a Cruelty somewhat resembling the Barbarity of the Heathens towards the Primitive Christians; first dresses you as if

were in the
a worryin
So tha
much as
in alledg
Fathers,
ror of th
Doctrine,
Sense of t
nistred b
was inva
at their R
(supposin
ror of the
Passages
impole u
or to mal
Learning
ancient L
the Air a
nist. And
you tae J
Ages, y
middle o
who live
deserve t
and after
above 4
first Thin
Note, ex
Lay-Bap
and disco
Collector
The S
disproved
by Learn
Disciplin
Athanasius
were

were in the Skin of some wild Beast, and then falls
a worrying you.

So that this Chapter demonstrates nothing so
much as the Author's Ignorance or Impertinency,
in alledging Quotations out of the Writings of the
Fathers, who wrote against the distinguishing Er-
ror of the Donatists, as if you had espoused this
Doctrine, and maintained with them against the
Sense of the Catholick Church, That Baptism admi-
nistrated by Heretical or Schismatical Clergymen
was invalid, and ought afterwards to be repeated
at their Return to the Church. It seems plain to me
(supposing this Author to understand what the Er-
ror of the Donatists was) that he transcribed those
Passages out of the Fathers with a Design either to
impole upon the Judgment of his weak Readers,
or to make a Flourish and Shew of his profound
Learning and familiar Acquaintance with those
ancient Doctors: For all this while he is beating
the Air and fighting only with a fancy'd Antago-
nist. And although he threatned to produce against
you the Judgment of the Catholick Church in all
Ages, yet his earliest Instances are below the
middle of the Fourth Century; (by the by, they
who lived in the preceding Ages, if any, surely
deserve to be called the *Primoprimitive Church*) and
and after all his Industry he has not mentioned
above 4 or 5 at the most, ancient Writers, for the
first Thirteen Centuries, and those of no great
Note, except St. *Austin*, who held the Validity of
Lay-Baptism, the rest are nothing to the purpose,
and discover only the Weakness or Vanity of the
Collector.

The Story of St. *Athanasius* has been so often
disproved, and is so generally esteemed Fabulous
by Learned Persons (neither agreeing with the
Discipline of the *Alexandrian Church*, the Age of
Athanasius, nor the Persecuted State of the Church,

B z

when

when this Ludicrous Baptism is supposed to have been transacted) that nothing but our Author's Ignorance can excuse his Repetition of it, without giving the least Hint of its ever having been suspected for a Falshood, or of the learned unanswerable Objections against it, by Dr. Cave, Dupin, Mr. Tillemont, the *Benedictine* Editors of St. Athanasius's Works, &c. I cannot see the least Similitude betwixt this Story, and your Baptizing us, to justify that rude, nonsensical Reflection which follows upon it. I am willing to own, that a Man of little more Learning than Mr. O——, might easily have furnished himself with more and better Authorities, than he has produced; and I wonder Mr. Bingham so well escaped the Hands of this pilfering Author. But those have been counterpoised by Authorities of equal Weight at least, you may find them collected, and the opposite ones fully considered by the Judicious Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, and in Dr. Bret's Learned Answer to Mr. Bingham's *Scholastical History*.

So little Cause had this conceited Plagiary proudly to insult over you, as he does in the Close of this Chapter, opprobriously stiling you a *Brace of dignify'd Deacons, who, giddy with the Honour of Sacred Orders, thought themselves capable by their Office to refine upon Antiquity, and to give Laws to their Apostolick Mother*. I shall not hereafter think it strange, to see this Author publish the most notorious Falshoods, since he calls you a Deacon, when any Church-man of tolerable Understanding in *Manchester*, who had always slept at his Devotion, could have satisfied him, that you have been in Priests Orders almost these two Years.

The Design of his second Chapter is to shew, That your Baptizing us was repugnant to the Principle and Practice of the Church of England, which he tells you, has all along allowed of Presbyterian, Independent

pendent, and Popish Baptism. To which I answer, first, in general: That the Church of England never thought her self infallible; she has not only declared her self liable to Error, (see Articles 19 and 21) but has proved herself so by the several Alterations made in her Rubricks and Articles. However, as to this Matter, I believe her to be in the right, and that this Author, even with all the Assistance which he has plentifully borrowed from his Brother Withers's Caveat, has not been able to prove that the Church of England at present allows the Validity of Lay-Baptism, or of Baptism dispensed by those, whom, for want of Episcopal Ordination, she deems to be no other than meer Laymen. He attempts to prove the contrary from 12 several Topicks.

Obj. I. First, *From her Judgment in Convocation, declared in the 55th Canon, where she requires all her Clergy to pray for the Presbyterian Kirk in Scotland by Name.*

Ans^w. But have the Members of that Convocation told us, That by the Church of Scotland in this Canon is meant the Presbyterian Kirk? Or, That every Clergyman who makes use of the Form of bidding Prayer, must needs comprehend so much in that Expression? Were there no Episcopal Congregations at that Time in North Britain? And why may we not understand these only to be the Church of Scotland? Mr. O——n is very positive, that both you, and your Undertaking Brother Mr. M——n subscribed this Canon at your Ordination. Truly, Sir, I am credibly informed, that no Clergyman does, or is required at his Ordination, to subscribe any Canon, besides the Three Articles in the 36th Canon. A fit Person this, to give an Account of the Practise of the Church of England.

Obj.

Obj. II. *From a late Declaration of her Bishops in Convocation.*

Answ. I believe he is the first Person that ever esteem'd the Opinion of a Majority of the Bishops, of one Province only, to be the Judgment of the Church of England: He might, for ought I know, as easily demonstrate Rebellion to be the Doctrine of our Church, because the greater Number of Bishops, at that dangerous Juncture, allowed contended for the Legality of Resistance. But what was become of your Canonical Obedience which you vowed to your Ordinary? I wonder what your Ordinary was concerned in that Resolution: But perhaps my infallible Uncle, or some such grave Elder might tell him, that the Bishop of Chester was a Member of that Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

Obj. III. *This was the Judgment of the old Compilers of the Common Prayer: In the Form of Prayer for all Conditions of Men, we pray for the good Estate of the Catholick Church, and in some Occasional Prayers compos'd since, we pray for the Reformed Churches abroad.*

Answ. I cannot perceive how this shews the Judgment of the old Compilers of the Common Prayer to favour Lay Baptism. I deny not the thing it self: But Mr O — might have found out better Mediums to prove it. As to those Expressions in the Forms of Common Prayer, they that join in the use of them, are at Liberty to take them in any Sense, which the Words themselves will fairly admit of: There is no Necessity of including in those Expressions, any that have not been baptized by Episcopally Ordained Ministers, because there are vast Multitudes in several Foreign Nations who have been baptized by Episcopally Ordained, the only true Ministers.

Obj. IV. *The greatest Divines of our Church have always concurred with her against Rebaptizations.*

Answ. I wish Mr. O — had express'd himself in more clear and distinct Terms, and not have begged the Question, as he does all along, calling that Baptism which we deny to be Baptism, and that Rebaptization which we maintain to be the only Baptism. His Meaning in this Objection, if it be any thing to the purpose, must be this: That those great Divines he afterwards mentions, were against Baptizing those Persons, who had been before sprinkled by Laymen, or Sham-Presbyters. Granting this

to be true, (for I am not much acquainted with their Writings, neither does he refer his Readers to any particular Places in their Works) I cannot yield the Judgments of particular Persons, tho' never so great or numerous, speaking in a private Capacity, to be the Doctrine of our Church (especially since others so famous for Learning and Piety have dissenting from them in this particular) nor indeed any thing besides what is contained in her Canons, Articles, Homilies and Book of Common Prayer.

Bp. Taylor, Bp. Beveridge, &c.

Our Author lays the greatest Stress upon the Judgment of the University of Oxford, declared in a Letter to the Genevians. What the University meant by those Complimentary Expressions, which he recites out of it, I shall not pretend to determine, but it is well known, that the Generality of her Members at present deny the Validity of Presbyterian Baptism, (I mean that supposed Baptism, which Persons ordained by Presbyters only dispense) and have plainly signified their Disallowance thereof, by gratuitously bestowing a Master's Degree, as a Reward of his beneficial Labours, upon the judicious Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*. Whatever at that Time was the Opinion of that Famous University, it ought not to pass for the Judgment of the Church. The Author's Reflections upon this Letter are such a Mixture of mean Scurrility and Non-sense, as shew him no less void of Sense than good Manners. *It is to be questioned whether these Gentlemen be legitimate Sons of the Church or no.—— Surely they rather sprung from a Schismatical Seminary, where private Opinions are hatcht in Fundamental Principles by the Enthusiastical Heat of the Soplings.—— A few shatterbrained Priests.* Who reads this, and does not admire the Politeness, Candour Mildness, and Ingenuity of its Author? Oh the modest, peaceable, Lamb-like Dispositions of our modern Dissenters! Their great Charity and Moderation (poor souls!) will not permit them to speak Evil of any who differ from them in their Sentiments: But I find, that neither a genteel Education, Learning, nor the most virtuous Qualifications, can shelter those, who refuse to speak or act as they would have them, from the deepest Strokes of their Malice, which they have in their Power to inflict. I am glad this *Doeg* has shot his Arrows, even bitter Words, where they are like to make the least Impression.

Obj.

Obj. V. *The Church of England is so far from condemning Presbyterian Baptism, that she has allowed of Baptism to Women, ever since the Reformation.*

Answ. Whatever she allowed before the Hampton-Conference, in the Case of Sickness only, the Alteration then made in the Rubrick before the Office for private Baptism, which, even in the greatest Exigence, allows none but the Minister to baptize, having been since confirmed by Act of Parliament, is a much better Proof of the Judgment of our Church against the Validity of Lay-Baptism than any thing Mr. O — n has produced to the contrary, and a much more proper Rule for Clergymen to order their Practice by, than the Judgment of particular Persons either before or since that Alteration.

Obj. VI. *The Validity of Baptism dispensed by Presbyterians is recognized by the Church in giving them Christian Burial.*

Answ. Whatever be the Practice of some particular Clergymen, I must profess, I do not see any Obligation they lie under to read the Burial Office over any Person who has not been baptized by one Episcopally Ordained. They rather seem, in my weak Judgment, restrained from doing it. Clergymen are forbid to read this Office over unbaptized Persons, and no Baptism is allowed by the Church but what is dispensed by the Minister, and our Laws know no Ministers but such as are Episcopally Ordained: So that there is no Danger of a Clergyman's incurring any Penalty by refusing Christian Burial to such unbaptized Persons; and there is less Fear of it, because it would be very difficult to bring legal Proof of the pretended Baptism of our Dissenters.

Obj. VII. *The Bishops in their triennial Visitations confirm several, who are Presbyterially as well as Episcopally baptized.*

Answ. If the Bishops confirmed such as they knew were never baptized by an Episcopally Ordained Minister, this only proves the Irregularity of the Practice; it being a flat Contradiction to the publick Form of Confirmation, which requires all those who seek for Confirmation, to declare in the Presence of God and the Congregation there present, that they acknowledge themselves bound to believe and do all those things which their Godfathers and Godmothers then undertook for them. None of our Dissenters, who had no Godfathers

Fathers and Godmothers in Baptism, are capable of answering to this Question, which they must do before their Confirmation: But here the Fault lies most at the door of the inferior Clergy, who are reasonably presumed to examine into the Fitness of Persons to be confirmed, before they present them to the Bishop at the Altar. *O* — *n* is mistaken, in imagining, that such as were confirmed by the Bishops immediately after the Restauration, generally speaking, received no other than what you deem Lay-Baptism; for it is well known, that the greater part of Presbyterian Teachers in those Times of Usurpation, had been before Ordained by Bishops; besides which, there were vast Numbers of silenced Ministers dispersed throughout the whole Nation, who baptized considerable Numbers of Children, whose Parents were then secretly well affected to Episcopacy.

Obj. VIII. Many who have been baptized by Presbyterians, and are come over to the Church, are owned as Christians, and received into Communion, without any Objection made against their Baptism.

Ans. It is granted they are so; but whether by the Rules of our Church they ought to be so, is another Question. Several of our Clergy allow their Baptism to be valid, and such may lawfully, if there be no other Obstacle, admit them to the Lord's Supper. I know others of a contrary Perswasion, who would rather undergo any Penalties, than knowingly in this respect act contrary to their unbiassed Minds. That which follows is a piece of senseless, incoherent Slander, without either Wit or Meaning, and smells so strong of Malice, as to make its Author rank with all sober considerate Readers.

Obj. IX. Several have, and now actually do, officiate in the Church, who were baptized only by a Presbyterian Minister.

Ans. This, for ought I know to the contrary, may be true; but is no Demonstration, that our Church allows Presbyterian Baptism to be Valid. I could name a Dissenting Teacher in Lancashire, who forged a Certificate from a Parochial Register to enable him to receive Episcopal Orders, but being detected, met with a Disappointment, and still continues a Powerful Applauded Teacher amongst the Dissenters: And perhaps others may have imposed upon our Bishops with the same Artifice. Our Author instances in the present Bishop of Exeter; but it has been

been unluckily discover'd, that an Episcopal Clergyman officiated at the time of his Baptism, in the Parish of Gregory's, London, where his Name is to be found in Parish-Register. [See Read's Answer to Withers's Case.] I shall have occasion to answer this more fully hereafter.

Ob. X. *The Deacons in our Church being no Priests, but half Ministers; and yet their Baptismal Administration is compleat in all its Parts, and good.*

Ans. Deacons in our Church are compleat Ministers in Baptism, being expressly authoriz'd to Baptize at their Ordination. Not many Pages before, the Author told that the Church labour'd under no Imperfections, but the Unhappiness of sheltering a few scatterbrain'd Priests: Here he falls foul upon the whole Order of Deacons. Our Adversaries say, i. e. he himself says, *These are a kind of amphibious Animals, half Laicks, and half Ecclesiasticks.* He would certainly have been more for his credit, to have disproved, than to have burlesqu'd this Order of Apostolic Institution; and his betaking himself to the latter of these is a shrewd Suspicion of his Inability to do the former.

Ob. XI. *The Church of England admits of Roman Baptism.*

Ans. The Church of England allows the Validity of Romish Orders; because dispens'd by Bishops, and admitting Romish Priests upon their Conversion, to officiate and hold Preferments in the Church, without Re-ordination: But she has not so good an Opinion of Presbyterian Orders, and therefore suffers not a Conforming Dissenter Teacher to do the Office of a Minister without Episcopal Ordination.

Obj. XII. *The Church does not think fit to Re-baptize those who have been once baptiz'd by Conforming Laymen.* For the Proof of this, he instances in two Persons, who made a sacrilegious Usurpation took upon them to perform ministerial Acts, and among others, Baptism without Ordination: Notwithstanding this, the Baptisms administered by these Sham-Priests (says he) were never repeated.

Ans. The Persons he names, are one Butler Lacy and Mr. D--le, the present School-master of Stockport. I have no opportunity of Enquiry what was done by them, or whether the Bishop of that Diocese gave Orders for the Baptizing those who had been sprinkled by that pretending Priest: But as to the present School-

master

her of *Stockport*, it is true, he pass'd for a Minister of Church ten Years together; during which time (if he may be believ'd) he sprinkled but Two or Three, which nam'd, and were afterwards baptiz'd by his own Brother, according to the express Direction of the present Archbishop of *York*. This Fact is so notorious, and was so frequently made the Subject of Discourse in all publick Companies, that if Mr. O---n had been willing to be at pains of Enquiring, before he publish'd this Falshood, almost any Person of Years of Discretion in *Stockport* would have inform'd him of the Truth of what is here related.

Mr. O---n tells you in the Close of this Chapter, that you should have taken care to have had me confirmed, before I receiv'd the other Sacrament. In answer to which need only transcribe the Rubrick at the End of the Confirmation Office; *And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be desired and desirous of being confirmed.*

Thus I have examin'd the Contents of the 2d Chapter; and leave the World to judge, whether any of the 12 Appicks he insists on, or all together, amount to a Demonstration, That your Baptizing us was *Repugnant to the Principles and Practice of the Church of England.*

In the Third Chapter the Author proposes to represent to you the pernicious Consequences of such a Practice. In answer to which, I shall only make a few short Remarks, and so put an end to this tedious Epistle.

In the first place, Sir, I cannot think you or my self much concern'd in the Contents of this Chapter; or that need any part of it touches the Merits of the Cause in debate. It is strange, you could not do, what you did in the modestest manner that was possible, for the satisfaction of a private Scruple, without reflecting upon her Majesty, aspersing the Royal Family, and striking at the Reformed Churches in the World. What if all the Reformed Churches in the World were of a different persuasion, or labour'd under the same Misfortune with myself? Must you or I for that reason neglect a known duty, and so be content to be damn'd out of Complaisance? That Doctrine of our Saviour's, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned,* when it was publish'd, reflected no less on the greatest Persons on Earth, and the Consequences

of it were as severe and terrible to almost all Mankind. But that could be no sufficient reason, why his Disciples should not embrace, practise and propagate the Belief of it too in the World. There is no doubt to be made, that our merciful God of his uncovenanted Goodness, bestows the Privileges of the New Covenant upon those Persons who neglect the appointed Means of Salvation, through no wilful or slothful Ignorance, or avoidable want of Opportunity. And I have that Charity for the greater part of Foreign Protestants not baptiz'd by Episcopal or ordained Ministers, as to believe their Ignorance of the Necessity involuntary, and in their circumstances unavoidable. Mr. O---n would fain insinuate into his Reader that *Presbyterian Government* prevails amongst all Protestants in Foreign Parts, except it be in the small Bishoprick of *Lubeck*; and to this end presents you with a pretended List of Foreign Reformed Churches, who, as he affirms with a brazen Assurance, are all *Presbyterian*. Whence he concludes very triumphantly, *That the whole Mass of the Reformation is at this day Presbyterian*, except in *England, Ireland, some of our Plantations, and the Bishoprick of Lubeck in Germany*.

Strange is the Impudence of this Author, in endeavouring thus to impose on the World in so notorious a matter. I cannot be supposed to be much acquainted with the Constitutions of Foreign Churches; but thus much I learn from a common Piece of Geography penn'd by Mr. Gordon, That in *Sweden* are Two Archbishopricks, viz. *Upsal* and *Riga*; Eight Bishopricks, viz. *Gottenburg, Strengues, Wexiö, Lunden, Landkeeping, Scaren, Abo* and *Wiburg*: That in *Norway* there is one Archbishoprick, viz. *Drontheim*; Bishopricks Three, viz. *Anslo, Bergen* and *Staffenger*: In *Denmark* One Archbishoprick, viz. *Copenhagen*; Bishopricks Five, viz. *Sleswick, Arhusen, Alburg, Ripen* and *Wiburg*: Besides those in the Protestant Part of *Germany*; † where though they are vulgarly called by other Names, they are ‡ solely entrusted with the Power

† We retain in our Churches, and are of opinion, that this Order ought to be retained among Ministers; that there should be some Bishops, some Priests and some Deacons. *Ger. Theol. de Ministr. Eccl. p. 232. Ed. 1639.*

‡ Our Practice witnesseth, that we give to Bishops only the Ordination of Ministers. *Ibid p. 183.*

Ordination, and such like Powers peculiar to those of the Episcopal Order. The *Lutherans*, it is true, do not acknowledge the Divine Institution of Episcopacy; yet esteem it as a useful and convenient Order, and expedient for preserving Peace and good Order in the Church: *Luther* himself calls it, *An Office most acceptable to God, and highly necessary and profitable to Men.* *Fabricii Loc. Com. Class. 4ta. p. 25. Ed. Lond.* From whence it is evident, That the greatest part of Foreign Protestants are subject to an Episcopal Government: Others, whose confessed Misfortune it is to want it, approve it so far as to allow its Antiquity, and with one Voice to condemn our *English Dissenters*, for acting in Opposition to it, and making this, amongst other things, a Pretence for Separation. See *Du- rel's Book of Foreign Churches*, or *Dr. Wells's Testimonies*; and the Letter lately sent from Geneva to Oxford.

I beg Leave in this Place to transcribe a Passage out of *Dr. Maurice's Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy*, p. 453, 454.

The Case of the Ordinations of our Dissenters is peculiar, and they do Foreign Churches great Wrong, when they concern them in the Quarrel: The Presbyterians have Ordinations from Presbyters, not only without, but in Opposition to Bishops, against all established Rules of this Church, against the Laws of the Country, as well as Practice of antient Churches: And if upon this account we pronounce them void, we do no more, than what all the Protestant Churches abroad would do in the like Case. If some Deacons or Laymen should take upon them to Ordain Pastors in the French Church for separate Congregations, in Opposition to the Received Discipline settled in their General Synods, I would appeal to the Ministers of those Churches, whether they held such an Ordination Valid: And by the Principles of those Churches Laymen may confer Orders in some Cases, as appears by the first Ordination in Paris, Hist. Eccl. T. 1. L. 2. where there was no Presbyter present; and by the Confession of Beza, Hist. Eccl. T. 1. L. 4. in the Conference of Poissy: Nay, though a Presbyter deposed by a Synod should take upon him to Ordain; I still appeal to the Ministers of those Churches, whether they would account the Orders Valid. If therefore we do judge such Ordinations here to be Nullities, because administered by subordinate Officers, against the Laws of our Church, in Opposition to their Superiors, we cannot be thought singular in this

this Judgment, since all antient Churches would have done the same thing, and all the Protestant Churches in Europe in the like Case would follow our Example.

Our Author takes it for granted, That the Royal Martyr had none, but what he calls Presbyterian Baptism: Is he sure, that there were no Episcopal Divines in Scotland at the Time of his Birth? Or, That King James made use of none of them, who at that Time had a great Veneration for the Order of Bishops? If we allow him this Supposition, it will not follow as he infers, that he is robbed of his Crown of Martyrdom, because Unbaptized Christians, *Catechumens*, who suffered for the Christian Faith, in the antient Church, were enrolled in the List of Martyrs.

It is farther objected by him, That this Doctrine concerning the Invalidity of Presbyterian Baptism, may produce *needless Scruples in many Persons of their Christianity: For who can be sure of their Christianity upon this Principle? They who were Episcopally Baptized, how do they know, but their Minister, or his Bishop, or some of his Predecessors were irregularly Baptized, i. e. Baptized by such as we account Laymen?*

Our Author in his first Chapter, to shew the Doctrine of the antient Church concerning Lay-Baptism, quotes an Epistle of Pope Nicolas's, wherein he declared for the Validity of Baptism conferr'd by a Jew, in the Name of the Father. &c. If Mr. O — n espouses not this Doctrine, to what Purpose did he produce this Testimony? Nay, does not the opposite Doctrine tend equally to the disquieting People's Consciences, since they can have no absolute Certainty, but that some of their Predecessors from whom they derived their Baptism, might be Baptized by one that was no Christian: If, to avoid such Scruples, he be of the same Opinion with that Pope, then he must confess, that he who was never baptized himself, may yet validly baptize others: This is what we affirm, and is sufficient to vanquish any Scruples about this Matter, That the Efficacy of a Sacrament depends not upon a Minister's own Baptism, which is a Personal Qualification relating only to himself: St. Paul was a Bishop before he was baptized, and it is not Baptism, (as Mr. O — n affirms in his last Paragraph) but a sufficient Call, that serves to make a Bishop or a Priest in the Christian Church.

But

But we are moreover told, That the Church of England
 lose her Christianity upon this Principle of denying
 the Invalidity of Presbyterian Baptism. See the Contents at
 the Head of this Chapter. But being unable to make this
 out, he was forced to shuffle when he came to Proof, and
 to maintain only, that upon the Principle of Rebaptizing he
 means Hereticks and Schismaricks, he does not see how the
 English Church can be secure of her Christianity: But this
 has been already answered by distinguishing betwixt Lay-
 Baptism, and that which is dispens'd by Real but Schisma-
 tical Clergymen, betwixt which there is certainly much
 Difference, though this Author confounds them through-
 out his whole Piece.

He has made King George a coarse Compliment upon his
 Accession to the Throne, in calling him a Presbyterian,
 which, if it should gain Credit, would give the far greatest
 part of his Subjects an Aversion to his Majesty, and render
 his Government troublesome and unsafe to him. It is no less
 scandalous Reflection upon his present Majesty, than it is
 upon the Memory of King James I. to say, he would have
 dyed a Presbyterian, if the Lustre of the British Crown had
 not opened his Eyes. The Obscurity and Insignificancy of
 this Pamphleteer is his chief Protection, otherwise he had
 Reason to expect his Superiors would do both him, and
 his injured Sovereign Justice.

As I am a Well-wisher to the Established Church, I
 would give this Author all possible Encouragement to write
 Pamphlets, and do assure him, if he will reply in the same
 Strain, and oblige us with a second Part of his Nonsense
 and Scurrility, and not be ashamed to own himself a *Dis-*
senting Teacher, I shall not trouble him, nor the World
 with a Rejoynder.

Were I a *Dissenter*, and a Friend of Mr. O——n's, I
 would advise him not to meddle hereafter with the Fa-
 thers; for he really seems not to know so much as the
 right Names of some of them, or the Times wherein they
 lived: Witness his quoting *Dionysius Alexander*, p. 9. for
Dionysius Alexandrinus, and that amongst the Writers of
 the Ninth Century: Besides, they are a sort of sharp-edged
 Tools, which it is hardly possible for a *Dissenter* to handle
 without cutting his own Fingers. I have good Grounds
 to believe, that every one of the Fathers he has quoted,
 and

and many others, who lived nearer the Times of the
fles, held the Necessity of Episcopal Government
surely he must be a Man of peculiar Effrontery, who
attack, or oppose an ancient Ecclesiastical Custom, that
been universally received, and as strenuously defended.

I am,

S I R,

Your Obligated Servant

F I N I S

E

B

Cu

- I. The Real
Introduc
Dipping o
- II. An Ans
and to Dr
- III. It is pro
and Prim
Aquinas's

Dr. Williams
med by C
Small Pos

By

LOND